arXiv:1608.05585v1 [q-fin.MF] 19 Aug 2016

Consistency of option prices under bid-ask spreads

Stefan Gerhold
TU Wien
sgerhold@fam.tuwien.ac.at

I. Cetin Gülüm *
TU Wien
ismail.gueluem@tuwien.ac.at

August 22, 2016

Abstract

Given a finite set of European call option prices on a single underlying, we want to know when there is a market model which is consistent with these prices. In contrast to previous studies, we allow models where the underlying trades at a bid-ask spread. The main question then is how large (in terms of a deterministic bound) this spread must be to explain the given prices. We fully solve this problem in the case of a single maturity, and give several partial results for multiple maturities. For the latter, our main mathematical tool is a recent generalization of Strassen's theorem [S. Gerhold, I.C. Gülüm, arXiv:1512.06640], which characterizes the existence of martingales in balls w.r.t. the infinity Wasserstein distance.

1 Introduction

Calibrating martingales to given option prices is a central topic of mathematical finance, and it is thus a natural question which sets of option prices admit such a fit, and which do not. Note that we are not interested in *approximate* model calibration, but in the consistency of option prices, and thus in arbitrage-free models that fit the given prices *exactly*. Put differently, we want to detect arbitrage in given prices. We do not consider continuous call price surfaces, but restrict to the (practically more relevant) case of finitely many strikes and maturities. Therefore, consider a financial asset with finitely many European call options written on it. In a frictionless setting, the consistency problem is well understood: Carr and Madan [4] assume that interest rates, dividends and bid-ask spreads are zero, and derive necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of arbitrage free models. Essentially, the given call prices must not admit calendar or butterfly arbitrage. Davis and Hobson [6] include interest rates and dividends and give similar results. They also describe explicit arbitrage strategies, whenever arbitrage exists. Concurrent related work has been done by Buehler [2]. Going beyond existence, Carr and Cousot [3] present practically appealing explicit constructions of calibrated martingales. More recently, Tavin [16] considers options on multiple assets and studies the existence of arbitrage strategies in this setting. Spoida [14] gives conditions for the consistency of a set of prices that contains not only vanillas, but also digital barrier options. See [10] for many related references.

As with virtually any result in mathematical finance, robustness with respect to market frictions is an important issue in assessing the practical appeal of these findings. Somewhat surprisingly, not much seems to be known about the consistency problem in this direction, the

*We acknowledge financial support from the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) under grant P 24880. We thank seminar and conference participants at Berlin, the 12th German Probability and Statistics Days (Bochum), Le Mans, Ulm, Vienna, and the 9th BFS Congress (NYC) for helpful questions and comments.

single exception being a paper by Cousot [5]. He allows positive bid-ask spreads on the options, but not on the underlying, and finds conditions on the prices that determine the existence of an arbitrage-free model explaining them.

The novelty of our paper is that we allow a bid-ask spread on the underlying. Without any further assumptions on the size of this spread, it turns out that there is no connection between the quoted price of the underlying and those of the calls: Any strategy trying to exploit unreasonable prices can be made impossible by a sufficiently large bid-ask spread on the underlying (see Example 2.3 and Proposition 6.1). In this respect, the problem is *not* robust w.r.t. the introduction of a spread on the underlying. However, an arbitrarily large spread seems questionable, given that spreads are usually tight for liquid underlyings. We thus enunciate that the appropriate question is not "when are the given prices consistent", but rather "how large a bid-ask spread on the underlying is needed to explain them?" We thus put a bound $\epsilon \geq 0$ on the (discounted) spread of the underlying and want to determine the smallest such ϵ that leads to a model explaining the given prices. We then refer to the call prices as ϵ-consistent (with the absence of arbitrage).

We assume discrete trading times and finite probability spaces throughout; no gain in tractability or realism is to be expected by not doing so. In the case of a single maturity, we obtain necessary and sufficient conditions for ϵ-consistency. The multi-period problem, on the other hand, seems to be challenging. We provide two partial results: necessary (but presumably not sufficient) conditions for ϵ-consistency, and necessary and sufficient conditions under simplifying assumptions. The latter, in particular, drop the bid-ask spread on the options, retaining only the spread on the underlying.

Recall that the main technical tool used in the papers [4, 5, 6] mentioned above to construct arbitrage-free models is Strassen's theorem [15], or modifications thereof. In the financial context, this theorem essentially states that option prices have to increase with maturity. This property breaks down if a spread on the underlying is allowed. We will therefore employ a recent generalization of Strassen's theorem, obtained in [9]. It gives necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of martingales within a prescribed distance, measured in terms of the infinity Wasserstein distance. This generalized Strassen theorem will be the key to obtain the ϵ-consistency conditions under simplified assumptions mentioned above.

The structure of the paper is as follows. In Section 2 we will describe our setting and give a precise formulation of our problem. Then, in Section 3 we will present necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of arbitrage free models with bounded bid-ask spreads for a single maturity. Necessary conditions for multiple maturities are found in Section 4, while Section 5 contains necessary and sufficient conditions under simplifying assumptions. There, we invoke the main result from [9]. In Section 6 we will discuss the case where models with unbounded spread are allowed; again, this gives an opportunity to apply results from [9]. We argue, though, that studying the consistency problem with unbounded spread seems to be unnatural. Section 7 concludes.

2 Notation and Preliminaries

Our time index set will be $\mathcal{T} = \{0, \dots, T\}$ throughout, where $1 \leq T \in \mathbb{N}$. Whenever we talk about "the given prices" or similarly, we mean the following data:

$$\text{A positive deterministic bank account } (B(t))_{t\in\mathcal{T}} \text{ with } B(0) = 1, \tag{2.1}$$

$$\text{strikes} \quad 0 < K_{t,1} < K_{t,2} < \cdots < K_{t,N_t}, \quad N_t \geq 1,\ t \in \mathcal{T}, \tag{2.2}$$

$$\text{corresponding call option bid and ask prices (at time zero)}$$

$$0 < \underline{r}_{t,i} \quad \text{resp.} \quad 0 < \overline{r}_{t,i}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq N_t,\ t \in \mathcal{T}, \tag{2.3}$$

$$\text{and the current bid and ask price of the underlying} \quad 0 < \underline{S}_0 \leq \overline{S}_0. \tag{2.4}$$

We write $D(t) = B(t)^{-1}$ for the time zero price of a zero-coupon bond maturing at t, and $k_{t,i} = D(t)K_{t,i}$ for the discounted strikes. The symbol $C_t(K)$ denotes a call option with maturity t and strike K.

In the presence of a bid-ask spread on the underlying, it is not obvious how to define the payoff of an option; this issue seems to have been somewhat neglected in the transaction costs literature. Indeed, suppose that an agent holds a call option with strike \$100, and that at maturity $T = 1$ bid and ask are $\underline{S}_1 = \$99$ resp. $\overline{S}_1 = \$101$. Then, the agent might wish to exercise the option to obtain a security that would cost him \$1 more in the market, or he may forfeit the option on the grounds that spending \$100 would earn him a position whose liquidation value is only \$99. The exercise decision cannot be nailed down without making further assumptions.

In the literature on option pricing under transaction costs, it is usually assumed that bid and ask of the underlying are constant multiples of a mid-price (often assumed to be geometric Brownian motion). This mid-price is then used as trigger to decide whether an option should be exercised, followed by physical delivery [1, 7, 17]. The assumption that such a constant-proportion mid-price triggers exercise seems to be rather ad-hoc, though. To deal with this problem in a parsimonious way, we assume that call options are cash-settled, using a reference price process S^C. This process evolves within the bid-ask spread. It is not a traded asset by itself, but just serves to fix the call option payoff $(S^C_t - K)^+$ for strike K and maturity t. This payoff is immediately transferred to the bank account without any costs.

Definition 2.1. A *model* consists of a finite probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with a discrete filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\in\mathcal{T}}$ and three adapted stochastic processes $\underline{S}$, $\overline{S}$, and S^C, satisfying[1]

$$0 < \underline{S}_t \leq S^C_t \leq \overline{S}_t, \quad t \in \mathcal{T}. \tag{2.5}$$

Clearly, $\underline{S}_t$ and $\overline{S}_t$ denote the bid resp. ask price of the underlying at time t. As for the reference price process S^C, we do not insist on a specific definition (such as, e.g., $S^C = \frac{1}{2}(\underline{S}+\overline{S})$), but allow *any* adapted process inside the bid-ask spread. We now give a definition for consistency of option prices, allowing for (arbitrarily large) bid-ask spreads on both the underlying and the options.

Definition 2.2. The prices (2.1)-(2.4) are *consistent with the absence of arbitrage,* if there is a model (in the sense of Definition 2.1) such that

- $\mathbb{E}[(D(t)S^C_t - k_{t,i})^+] \in [\underline{r}_{t,i}, \overline{r}_{t,i}], \quad 1 \leq i \leq N_t,\ t \in \mathcal{T},$
- There is a consistent price system for the underlying, i.e., a process S^* such that $\underline{S}_t \leq S^*_t \leq \overline{S}_t$ for $t \in \mathcal{T}$ and such that $(D(t)S^*_t)_{t\in\mathcal{T}}$ is a $\mathbb{P}$-martingale.[2]

[1] Equations and inequalities among random variables are always understood to hold almost surely.

[2] Note that we do not mention the physical probability measure, as it is of no relevance to our study.

The process S^* is also called a shadow price. According to Kabanov and Stricker [12] (see also [13]), these requirements yield an arbitrage free model comprising bid and ask price processes for the underlying and each call option. Indeed, for the call with maturity t and strike $K_{t,i}$, one may take $\big(\underline{r}_{t,i}\mathbf{1}_{\{s=0\}} + B(s)\mathbb{E}[(D(t)S^C_t - k_{t,i})^+|\mathcal{F}_s]\mathbf{1}_{\{s>0\}}\big)_{s\in\mathcal{T}}$ as bid price process (and similarly for the ask price), and $\big(B(s)\mathbb{E}[(D(t)S^C_t - k_{t,i})^+|\mathcal{F}_s]\big)_{s\in\mathcal{T}}$ as consistent price system.

As mentioned in the introduction, if consistency is defined according to Definition 2.2, then there is no interplay between the current prices of the underlying and the options, which seems to make little sense. As an illustration, the following example shows how frictionless arbitrage strategies may fail in the presence of a sufficiently large spread; a general result is given in Section 6 below.

Example 2.3. Let $c > 0$ be arbitrary. We set $k := k_{1,1} = k_{2,1} = 1$ and assume

$$B(1) = B(2) = 1, \quad \underline{S}_0 = \overline{S}_0 = 2, \quad r_1 := \underline{r}_{1,1} = \overline{r}_{1,1} = c + 1, \quad r_2 := \underline{r}_{2,1} = \overline{r}_{2,1} = 1.$$

Thus $C_1(k)$ is "too expensive", and without frictions, buying $C_2(k) - C_1(k)$ would be an arbitrage opportunity (upon selling one unit of stock if $C_1(k)$ expires in the money). In particular, the first condition from Corollary 4.2 in [6] and equation (5) in [5] are violated: they both state that $r_1 \leq r_2$ is necessary for the absence of arbitrage strategies.

But with spreads we can choose c as large as we want and still the above prices would be consistent with no-arbitrage. Indeed, we can define a deterministic model as follows:

$$\underline{S}_1 = \underline{S}_2 = 2, \quad \overline{S}_1 = 2c + 2, \quad \overline{S}_2 = 2, \quad S^C = \frac{1}{2}(\underline{S} + \overline{S}).$$

Note that

$$(S^C_2 - k)^+ = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad (S^C_1 - k)^+ = c + 1.$$

This model is free of arbitrage (see Proposition 6.1 below). In particular, consider the portfolio $C_2(k) - C_1(k)$: the short call $-C_1(k)$ finishes in the money with payoff $-(c+1)$. This cannot be compensated by going short in the stock, because its bid price stays at 2. The payoff at time $t = 2$ of this strategy, with shorting the stock at time $t = 1$, is

$$(S^C_2 - k)^+ - (S^C_1 - k)^+ - (\overline{S}_2 - \underline{S}_1) = -c < 0.$$

Our focus will thus be on a stronger notion of consistency, where the discounted spread on the underlying is bounded. Hence, our goal becomes to determine how large a spread is needed to explain given option prices.

Definition 2.4. Let $\epsilon \geq 0$. Then the prices (2.1)-(2.4) are *ϵ-consistent with the absence of arbitrage,* or simply *ϵ-consistent,* if they are consistent (Definition 2.2) and the following conditions hold:

$$\overline{S}_t - \underline{S}_t \leq \epsilon B(t), \quad t \in \mathcal{T}, \tag{2.6}$$

$$S^C_t \geq \epsilon B(t), \quad t \in \mathcal{T}. \tag{2.7}$$

The bound (2.7) is an additional mild assumption on the reference price S^C, made for tractability, and makes sense given the actual size of market prices and spreads (recall that $\underline{S} \leq S^C$). With the same justification, in our main results on ϵ-consistency we will assume that all discounted strikes $k_{t,i}$ are larger than ϵ. If $\epsilon = 0$ and the bid and ask prices in (2.3) and (2.4) agree, then we recover the frictionless consistency definition from [6].

As mentioned above, we do not insist on any specific definition of the reference price S^C. However, it is not hard to show that choosing $S^C = \frac{1}{2}(\underline{S} + \overline{S})$ yields almost the same notion of ϵ-consistency:

Proposition 2.5. *Assume that we are only interested in arbitrage free models where, in addition to the requirements of Definition 2.4, we have that*

$$S_t^C = \frac{\underline{S}_t + \overline{S}_t}{2}, \quad t \in \mathcal{T}. \tag{2.8}$$

Let us then call the prices (2.1)-(2.4) arithmetically ϵ-consistent. For $\epsilon \geq 0$, the prices are arithmetically 2ϵ-consistent if and only if they are ϵ-consistent.

Proof. First, assume that there exists an arithmetically 2ϵ-consistent model with corresponding stochastic processes $(\underline{S}_t, \overline{S}_t, S_t^C, S_t^*)_{t\in\mathcal{T}}$. We define new bid and ask prices $\underline{S}'_t := S_t^C \wedge S_t^*$ and $\overline{S}'_t := S_t^C \vee S_t^*$. Then (2.8) implies that $\overline{S}'_t - \underline{S}'_t \leq B(t)\epsilon$. Therefore, the model consisting of $(\underline{S}'_t, \overline{S}'_t, S_t^C, S_t^*)_{t\in\mathcal{T}}$ is ϵ-consistent. Conversely, assume that the given prices are ϵ-consistent. Then there exist processes $(S_t^C)_{t\in\mathcal{T}}$ and $(S_t^*)_{t\in\mathcal{T}}$ on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ such that $|S_t^C - S_t^*| \leq B(t)\epsilon$ a.s. We then simply set $\underline{S}_t = S_t^C - B(t)\epsilon$ and $\overline{S}_t = S_t^C + B(t)\epsilon$, and have thus constructed an arithmetically 2ϵ-consistent model. □

Note that the statement of Proposition 2.5 does not hold for consistency (instead of ϵ-consistency), nor does it hold if we replace (2.8) with

$$S_t^C = p\underline{S}_t + (1-p)\overline{S}_t, \quad t \in \mathcal{T},$$

where $p \in [0,1]$ and $p \neq \frac{1}{2}$.

We now define semi-static trading strategies in the bank account, the underlying asset, and the call options. Here, semi-static means that the position in the call options is fixed at time zero. The definition is model-independent; as soon as a model (in the sense of Definition 2.1) is chosen, the number of risky shares at time t, e.g., becomes

$$\phi_t^1\big((\underline{S}_u)_{u\leq t}, (S_u^C)_{u\leq t}, (\overline{S}_u)_{u\leq t}\big). \tag{2.9}$$

Definition 2.6. (*i*) A *semi-static portfolio*, or *semi-static trading strategy*, is a triple

$$\Phi = \Big((\phi_t^0)_{t\in\mathcal{T}}, (\phi_t^1)_{t\in\mathcal{T}}, (\phi^{t,i})_{t\in\mathcal{T}, i\in\{1,\dots,N_t\}}\Big),$$

where $\phi_0^0 \in \mathbb{R}$, $\phi_t^0 : (0,\infty)^{3t} \to \mathbb{R}$ is Borel measurable for $1 \leq t \leq T$, analogously for ϕ^1, and $\phi^{t,i} \in \mathbb{R}$ for $t \in \mathcal{T}, i \in \{1,\dots,N_t\}$. Here, ϕ_t^0 denotes the investment in the bank account, ϕ_t^1 denotes the number of stocks held at time $t \in \mathcal{T}$, and $\phi^{t,i} \in \mathbb{R}$ is the number of options with maturity $t \in \mathcal{T}$ and strike $K_{t,i}$ which the investor buys at time zero.

(*ii*) A semi-static portfolio is called *self-financing,* if

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_t^0(\boldsymbol{s}_t) = \phi_{t-1}^0(\boldsymbol{s}_{t-1}) + \sum_{i=1}^{N_t} \phi^{t,i}(s_t^C - K_{t,i})^+ \\ - \big(\phi_t^1(\boldsymbol{s}_t) - \phi_{t-1}^1(\boldsymbol{s}_{t-1})\big)^+ \overline{s}_t + \big(\phi_t^1(\boldsymbol{s}_t) - \phi_{t-1}^1(\boldsymbol{s}_{t-1})\big)^- \underline{s}_t\end{aligned}$$

holds for $1 \leq t \leq T$ and $\underline{s}_u, s_u^C, \overline{s}_u \in (0,\infty)$, $1 \leq u \leq t$, where

$$\boldsymbol{s}_t := \big((\underline{s}_u)_{1\leq u\leq t}, (s_u^C)_{1\leq u\leq t}, (\overline{s}_u)_{1\leq u\leq t}\big). \tag{2.10}$$

Recall that the call options are cash-settled. Therefore, ϕ_t^0 includes the payoffs of all options with maturity t.

(*iii*) For prices (2.1)-(2.4), the *initial portfolio value* of a semi-static portfolio Φ is given by

$$r_\Phi := \phi_0^0 + \big((\phi_0^1)^+\overline{S}_0 - (\phi_0^1)^-\underline{S}_0\big) + \sum_{\substack{t\in\mathcal{T}\\ t>0}}\sum_{i=1}^{N_t}\big((\phi^{t,i})^+\overline{r}_{t,i} - (\phi^{t,i})^-\underline{r}_{t,i}\big).$$

This is the cost of setting up the portfolio Φ.

Having defined semi-static portfolios, we can now formulate two useful notions of arbitrage.

Definition 2.7. Let $\epsilon \geq 0$. The prices (2.1)-(2.4) admit *model-independent arbitrage with respect to spread-bound* ϵ, if we can form a self-financing semi-static portfolio Φ in the bank account, the underlying asset and the options, such that the initial portfolio value r_Φ is negative and the following holds: For all real numbers $\underline{s}_t, s_t^C, \overline{s}_t \in (0,\infty)$, $1 \leq t \leq T$, that satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < \underline{s}_t \leq s_t^C \leq \overline{s}_t, &\quad 1 \leq t \leq T,\\ \overline{s}_t - \underline{s}_t \leq \epsilon B(t), &\quad 1 \leq t \leq T,\\ s_t^C \geq \epsilon B(t), &\quad 1 \leq t \leq T, \end{aligned}$$

(cf. (2.5), (2.6), and (2.7)), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_T^0(\boldsymbol{s}_T) &\geq 0,\\ \phi_T^1(\boldsymbol{s}_T) &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

where $\boldsymbol{s}$ is defined in (2.10).

In particular, if Φ is such a strategy, then for any model satisfying (2.6) and (2.7), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_T^0\big((\underline{S}_u)_{1\leq u\leq T}, (S_u^C)_{1\leq u\leq T}, (\overline{S}_u)_{1\leq u\leq T}\big) &\geq 0,\\ \phi_T^1\big((\underline{S}_u)_{1\leq u\leq T}, (S_u^C)_{1\leq u\leq T}, (\overline{S}_u)_{1\leq u\leq T}\big) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Definition 2.8. Let $\epsilon \geq 0$. The prices (2.1)-(2.4) admit a *weak arbitrage opportunity with respect to spread-bound* ϵ if there is no model-independent arbitrage strategy (with respect to spread-bound ϵ), but for any model satisfying (2.6) and (2.7), there is a semi-static portfolio Φ such that the initial portfolio value r_Φ is non-positive,

$$\begin{aligned} &\phi_T^0\big((\underline{S}_u)_{1\leq u\leq T}, (S_u^C)_{1\leq u\leq T}, (\overline{S}_u)_{1\leq u\leq T}\big) \geq 0,\\ &\mathbb{P}\big(\phi_T^0\big((\underline{S}_u)_{1\leq u\leq T}, (S_u^C)_{1\leq u\leq T}, (\overline{S}_u)_{1\leq u\leq T}\big) > 0\big) > 0, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\phi_T^1\big((\underline{S}_u)_{1\leq u\leq T}, (S_u^C)_{1\leq u\leq T}, (\overline{S}_u)_{1\leq u\leq T}\big) = 0.$$

Most of the time we will fix $\epsilon \geq 0$ and write only *model-independent arbitrage,* meaning model-independent arbitrage with respect to spread-bound ϵ, and similarly for weak arbitrage. The notion of weak, i.e. model-dependent, arbitrage was first used in [6], where the authors give examples to highlight the distinction between weak arbitrage and model-independent arbitrage. The crucial difference is that a weak arbitrage opportunity may depend on the null sets of the model. E.g., suppose that we would like to use two different arbitrage strategies according to whether a certain call will expire in the money with positive probability or not. Such portfolios could serve to exhibit weak arbitrage (Definition 2.8), but will not show model-independent arbitrage (Definition 2.7).

Note that the process $(D(t)S^C_t)_{t\in\mathcal{T}}$ does not have to be a martingale, since S^C is not traded on the market. The option prices give us some information about the marginals of the process S^C, though. On the other hand, the process $(D(t)S^*_t)_{t\in\mathcal{T}}$ has to be a martingale, but we have no information about its marginals, except that $|S^*_t - S^C_t| \le \epsilon B(t)$. This is equivalent to

$$W^\infty\Big(\mathcal{L}\big(D(t)S^C_t\big), \mathcal{L}\big(D(t)S^*_t\big)\Big) \le \epsilon, \quad t \in \mathcal{T}, \tag{2.11}$$

where W^∞ denotes the infinity Wasserstein distance, and $\mathcal{L}$ the law of a random variable. We define W^∞ on $\mathcal{M}$, the set of probability measures on $\mathbb{R}$ with finite mean, by

$$W^\infty(\mu,\nu) = \inf \|X - Y\|_\infty, \quad \mu,\nu \in \mathcal{M}.$$

The infimum is taken over all probability spaces $(\Omega,\mathcal{F},\mathbb{P})$ and random pairs (X,Y) with marginals given by μ and ν. Clearly, for $\epsilon \ge 0$ and random variables X and Y, we have that

$$\mathbb{P}(|X-Y| > \epsilon) = 0 \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad W^\infty(\mathcal{L}X, \mathcal{L}Y) \le \epsilon.$$

See [9] for some references on W^∞.

Definition 2.9. Let μ,ν be two measures in $\mathcal{M}$. Then we say that μ is smaller in *convex order* than ν, in symbols $\mu \le_c \nu$, if for every convex function $\phi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ we have that $\int \phi\, d\mu \le \int \phi\, d\nu$, as long as both integrals are well-defined. A family of measures $(\mu_t)_{t\in\mathcal{T}}$ in $\mathcal{M}$ is called a *peacock*, if $\mu_s \le_c \mu_t$ for all $s \le t$ in $\mathcal{T}$ (see Definition 1.3 in [11]).

For $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$ we define

$$R_\mu(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} (y-x)^+ \mu(dy), \tag{2.12}$$

the call function of μ. The mean of a measure μ will be denoted by $\mathbb{E}\mu = \int y\,\mu(dy)$. These notions are useful for constructing models for ϵ-consistent prices, as made explicit by the following lemma. As is evident from its proof, the sequence (μ_t) consists of the marginals of a (discounted) reference price, whereas (ν_t) gives the marginals of a (discounted) consistent price system.

Lemma 2.10. *For $\epsilon \ge 0$ the prices (2.1)-(2.4) are ϵ-consistent with the absence of arbitrage, if there are sequences of measures $(\mu_t)_{t\in\mathcal{T}}$ and $(\nu_t)_{t\in\mathcal{T}}$ in $\mathcal{M}$ such that:*

(i) $R_{\mu_t}(k_{t,i}) \in [\underline{r}_{t,i}, \overline{r}_{t,i}]$ *for all* $t \in \mathcal{T}$ *and* $i \in \{1,\dots,N_t\}$, *and* $\mu_t([\epsilon,\infty)) = 1$,

(ii) $(\nu_t)_{t\in\mathcal{T}}$ *is a peacock and its mean satisfies* $\mathbb{E}\nu \in [\underline{S}_0, \overline{S}_0]$, *and*

(iii) $W^\infty(\mu_t,\nu_t) \le \epsilon$ *for all* $t \in \mathcal{T}$.

Proof. Let $(\mu_t)_{t\in\mathcal{T}}$ and $(\nu_t)_{t\in\mathcal{T}}$ be as above. Recall that Strassen's theorem [9, 15] asserts that any peacock is the sequence of marginals of a martingale. Therefore, there is a finite probability space $(\Omega,\mathcal{F},\mathbb{P})$ with a martingale $(\widetilde{S}_t)_{t\in\mathcal{T}}$ such that ν_t is the law of $\widetilde{S}_t$ for $t \in \mathcal{T}$. Let S^C be an adapted (to the filtration generated by $\widetilde{S}$) process such that $D(t)S^C_t \sim \mu_t$ for $t \in \mathcal{T}$. By the definition of the infinity Wasserstein distance, we then have

$$\mathbb{P}\big(|D(t)S^C_t - \widetilde{S}_t| \le \epsilon\big) = 1.$$

Defining

$$S^*_t := B(t)\widetilde{S}_t, \quad \underline{S}_t := S^C_t \wedge S^*_t, \quad \overline{S}_t := S^C_t \vee S^*_t$$

for $t \in \mathcal{T}$ yields an arbitrage free model. □

3 Single maturity: ϵ-consistency

In this section, we characterize ϵ-consistency (according to Definition 2.4) in the special case that all option maturities agree. The consistency conditions for a single maturity are similar to those derived in Theorem 3.1 of [6] and Proposition 3 of [5]. In addition to the conditions given there, we have to assume that the mean of S_t^C is "close enough" to S_0.

We fix $t = 1 \in \mathcal{T}$ and often drop the time index for notational convenience, i.e. we write $\overline{r}_i$ instead of $\overline{r}_{1,i}$ etc. In the frictionless case the underlying can be identified with an option with strike $k = 0$. Here we will do something similar: in the formulation of the next theorem we set $k_0 = \epsilon$, as if we would introduce an option with strike $\epsilon B(1)$, but we think of $C(\epsilon B(1))$ as the underlying. The choices for $\underline{r}_0 = \underline{S}_0 - 2\epsilon$ and $\overline{r}_0 = \overline{S}_0$ made in Theorem 3.1 can be motivated as follows: in every model which is ϵ-consistent with the absence of arbitrage, (2.7) implies that the discounted expected payoff of an option with strike $\epsilon B(1)$ has to satisfy

$$D(1)\mathbb{E}[(S_1^C - \epsilon B(1))^+] = D(1)\mathbb{E}[S_1^C] - \epsilon.$$

Furthermore, to guarantee the existence of a consistent price system, $D(1)\mathbb{E}[S_1^C]$ has to lie in the closed interval $[\underline{S}_0 - \epsilon, \overline{S}_0 + \epsilon]$, which implies that the price of an option with strike $B(1)\epsilon$ has to lie in the interval $[\underline{S}_0 - 2\epsilon, \overline{S}_0]$. Therefore, in the proof of Theorem 3.1 (given in Appendix A) we will use the symbol $C_t(\epsilon B(t))$ as a reference to the underlying and $-C_t(\epsilon B(t))$ is a reference to a short position in the underlying plus an additional deposit of 2ϵ in the bank account.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $\epsilon \geq 0$ and consider prices as at the beginning of Section 2, with $T = 1$ and $k_1 > \epsilon$ (see the remarks after (2.7)). Moreover, for ease of notation (see the above remarks) we set $k_0 = \epsilon$, $\underline{r}_0 = \underline{S}_0 - 2\epsilon$, and $\overline{r}_0 = \overline{S}_0$. Then the prices are ϵ-consistent (see Definition 2.4) if and only if the following conditions hold:*

(i) All butterfly spreads have non-negative time-0 price, i.e.

$$\frac{\overline{r}_l - \underline{r}_j}{k_l - k_j} \geq \frac{\underline{r}_j - \overline{r}_i}{k_j - k_i}, \quad 0 \leq i < j < l \leq N. \tag{3.1}$$

(ii) Call-spreads must not be too expensive, i.e.

$$\frac{\overline{r}_l - \underline{r}_i}{k_l - k_i} \geq -1, \quad 0 \leq i < l \leq N. \tag{3.2}$$

(iii) All call-spreads have non-negative time-0 price, i.e.

$$\underline{r}_j \leq \overline{r}_i, \quad 0 \leq i < j \leq N. \tag{3.3}$$

(iv) If a call-spread is available for zero cost, then the involved options have zero bid resp. ask price, i.e.

$$\underline{r}_j = \overline{r}_i \;\Rightarrow\; \underline{r}_j = \overline{r}_i = 0, \quad 0 \leq i < j \leq N. \tag{3.4}$$

Moreover, there is a model-independent arbitrage, as soon as any of the conditions (i)-(iii) is not satisfied.

This theorem is proved in Appendix A. Supplementing Theorem 3.1, we now show that there is only weak arbitrage if (3.4) fails, i.e., no model-independent arbitrage. This is the content of the following proposition; its proof is a modification of the last part of the proof of Theorem 3.1 from [6], and is presented in Appendix B. We conclude that the trichotomy of consistency/weak arbitrage/model-independent arbitrage, which was uncovered by Davis and Hobson [6] in the frictionless case, persists under bid-ask spreads (at least in the one-period setting).

Proposition 3.2. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 3.1, there is a weak arbitrage opportunity if (3.1), (3.2) and (3.3) hold, but (3.4) fails, i.e. there exist $i < j$ such that $\overline{r}_i = \underline{r}_j > 0$.*

For $\epsilon = 0$ and $\underline{r}_i = \overline{r}_i = r_i$, the conditions from Theorem 3.1 simplify to

$$0 \geq \frac{r_{i+1} - r_i}{k_{i+1} - k_i} \geq \frac{r_i - r_{i-1}}{k_i - k_{i-1}} \geq -1, \quad \text{for } i \in \{1, \dots, N-1\},$$

and

$$r_i = r_{i-1} \quad \text{implies} \quad r_i = 0, \quad \text{for } i \in \{1, \dots, N\}.$$

These are exactly the conditions required in Theorem 3.1 of [6].

Remark 3.3. Note that in contrast to the frictionless case, we do not have to require that bid or ask prices decrease as the strike increases, in order to get models which are ϵ-consistent with the absence of arbitrage. This means that we do not have to require $\underline{r}_i \geq \underline{r}_j$ or $\overline{r}_i \geq \overline{r}_j$ for $i < j$, as shown in the following example.

Consider two call options, where $\epsilon = 0$ (no spread on the underlying), and the prices are given by $\underline{S}_0 = \overline{S}_0 = 4$, $\overline{r}_i = i + 5$, $\underline{r}_i = 1 + \frac{i}{2}, k_i = i$ for $i = 1, 2$. We assume that the bank account is constant until maturity. The prices and a possible choice of shadow prices are shown in Figure 1. (Note that, in the proof of Theorem 3.1 in Appendix A, e_i denotes the shadow price of the option with strike k_i.) Clearly all conditions from Theorem 3.1 are satisfied, and therefore there exists



Figure 1: This example shows that it is not necessary that the ask-prices resp. bid-prices decrease w.r.t. strike. The line represents the call function of δ_5.

an arbitrage free model. For example we can choose $\mu = \delta_5$, where δ denotes the Dirac delta.

This example shows that, in our setting, prices which are admissible from a no-arbitrage point of view do not necessarily make economic sense: Since the payoff of $C(K_2)$ at maturity never exceeds the payoff of $C(K_1)$, the utility indifference ask-price of $C(K_2)$ should not be higher than the utility indifference ask-price of $C(K_1)$.

4 Multiple maturities: necessary conditions for ϵ-consistency

The ϵ-consistency conditions for a single maturity (Theorem 3.1) are a generalisation of the frictionless conditions in [5, 6]. They guarantee that for each maturity $t \in \mathcal{T}$ the option prices can be associated to a measure μ_t, such that $\mathbb{E}\mu_t \in [\underline{S}_0, \overline{S}_0]$ (cf. Lemma 2.10). In this section we state *necessary* conditions for multiple periods. Our conditions (see Definition 4.1 and Theorem 4.3) are fairly involved, and we thus expect that it might not be easy to obtain tractable *equivalent* conditions, instead of just necessary ones. In the case where there is only a spread on the options, but not on the underlying, it suffices to compare prices with only three or two different maturities (see equations (4), (5) and (6) in [5] and Corollary 4.2 in [6]) to obtain suitable consistency conditions. These conditions ensure that the family of measures $(\mu_t)_{t\in\mathcal{T}}$ is a peacock.

If we consider a bid-ask spread on the underlying and want to check for ϵ-consistency according to Definition 2.4 ($\epsilon > 0$), it turns out that we need conditions that involve all maturities simultaneously (this will become clear by condition (5.2) below). We thus introduce calendar vertical baskets (CVB), portfolios which consist of various long and short positions in the call options. We first give a definition of CVBs. Then, in Lemma 4.2 we will study a certain trading strategy involving a short position in a CVB: this strategy will then serve as a base for the conditions in Theorem 4.3, which is the main result of this section. Note that our definition of a CVB depends on $\epsilon \geq 0$: the contract defined in Definition 4.1 only provides necessary conditions in markets where the bid-ask spread is bounded by $\epsilon \geq 0$.

Definition 4.1. Fix $u \in \mathcal{T}$ and $\epsilon \geq 0$ and assume that vectors $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_u)$, $\boldsymbol{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_u)$, $\boldsymbol{I} = (i_1, \dots, i_{u-1})$ and $\boldsymbol{J} = (j_1, \dots, j_u)$ are given, such that

(*i*) $x_t \in \mathbb{R}$ for all $t \in \{1, \dots, u\}$,

(*ii*) $\sigma_1 \in \{-1, 1\}$ and $\sigma_t = \operatorname{sgn}(x_{t-1} - x_t)$ for all $t \in \{2, \dots, u\}$,

(*iii*) $i_t \in \{0, \dots, N_{t+1}\}$ and $k_{t+1,i_t} \leq x_t + \epsilon\sigma_{t+1}$ for all $t \in \{1, \dots, u-1\}$,

(*iv*) $j_t \in \{0, \dots, N_t\}$ and $k_{t,j_t} = x_t + \epsilon\sigma_t$ for all $t \in \{1, \dots, u\}$.

Then we define a *calendar vertical basket* with these parameters as the contract

$$CVB_u(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{I}, \boldsymbol{J}) = C_1(K_{1,j_1}) + \sum_{t=2}^{u} \Big(C_t\big(K_{t,j_t}\big) - C_t\big(K_{t,i_{t-1}}\big) \Big) - 2\epsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\sigma_1 = -1\}}. \tag{4.1}$$

The market ask resp. bid-price of $CVB_u(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{I}, \boldsymbol{J})$ are given by

$$\overline{r}_u^{CVB}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{I}, \boldsymbol{J}) = \overline{r}_{1,j_1} + \sum_{t=2}^{u} \big(\overline{r}_{t,j_t} - \underline{r}_{t,i_{t-1}} \big) - 2\epsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\sigma_1 = -1\}},$$
$$\underline{r}_u^{CVB}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{I}, \boldsymbol{J}) = \underline{r}_{1,j_1} + \sum_{t=2}^{u} \big(\underline{r}_{t,j_t} - \overline{r}_{t,i_{t-1}} \big) + 2\epsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\sigma_1 = -1\}}.$$

We will refer to u as the maturity of the CVB.

Lemma 4.2. *Fix $\epsilon \geq 0$. For all parameters $u, \boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{I}, \boldsymbol{J}$ as in Definition 4.1, there is a self-financing semi-static portfolio Φ whose initial value is given by $r_\Phi = -\underline{r}_u^{CVB}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{I}, \boldsymbol{J})$, such that for all models satisfying (2.6) and (2.7) and for all $t \in \mathcal{T}$ one of the following conditions holds:*

(i) $\phi_t^0 \geq 0$ *and* $\phi_t^1 = 0$, *or*

(ii) $\phi_t^0 \geq k_{t,j} - \epsilon\sigma_t$ *and* $\phi_t^1 = -1$.

The arguments of ϕ_t^0, ϕ_t^1 are of course the same as in (2.9), and are omitted for brevity. In the proof of Lemma 4.2, we define the functions ϕ_t^0, ϕ_t^1 inductively. As we are defining a model-independent strategy, we could also use the real dummy variables (2.10) from Definition 2.6 as arguments. It seems more natural to write $(\underline{S}_u)_{u\leq t}, (S_u^C)_{u\leq t}, (\overline{S}_u)_{u\leq t}$, though. We just have to keep in mind that ϕ_t^0, ϕ_t^1 have to be constructed as *functions* of $(\underline{S}_u)_{u\leq t}, (S_u^C)_{u\leq t}, (\overline{S}_u)_{u\leq t}$, without using the *distribution* of these random vectors.

Proof of Lemma 4.2. Assume that we buy the contract

$$-CVB_u(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{I}, \boldsymbol{J}) = -C_1(K_{1,j_1}) + \sum_{t=2}^{u} \Big(C_t\big(K_{t,i_{t-1}}\big) - C_t\big(K_{t,j_t}\big) \Big) + 2\epsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\sigma_1 = -1\}}, \tag{4.2}$$

thus we are getting an initial payment of $\underline{r}_u^{CVB}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{I}, \boldsymbol{J})$. We have to keep in mind that if $i_t = 0$ for some $t \in \{1, \dots, u-1\}$, then the corresponding expression in (4.2) denotes a long position in the underlying, and if $j_t = 0$ for some $t \in \{1, \dots, u\}$, then the expression $-C_t(K_{t,j_t})$ in (4.2) denotes a short position in the underlying plus an additional deposit of 2ϵ in the bank account at time 0 (see the beginning of Section 3). To ease notation, we will write $K_{t,i}$ instead of $K_{t,i_{t-1}}$ and $K_{t,j}$ instead of K_{t,j_t}.

We will show inductively that at the end of each period $t \in \{1, \dots, u\}$ we can end up in one of two scenarios: either the investor holds a non-negative amount of bank units (i.e. $\phi_t^0 \geq 0$), we will call this scenario A, or we have one short position in the underlying (i.e. $\phi_t^1 = -1$) and $\phi_t^0 \geq k_{t,j} - \epsilon\sigma_t$; we will refer to this as scenario B. Note that scenarios A and B are not disjoint, but this will not be a problem.

We will first deal with the case where $\sigma_1 = -1$ and afterwards with the case $\sigma_1 = 1$. We start with $t = 1$ and first assume that $j_1 > 0$. If $C_1(K_{1,j})$ expires out of the money, then we do not trade at time 1 and obtain $\phi_1^0 = 2\epsilon \geq 0$, so we are in scenario A. Otherwise we sell one unit of the underlying, and thus

$$\phi_1^0 = 2\epsilon + k_{1,j} + D(1)\big(\underline{S}_1 - S_1^C\big) \geq k_{1,j} + \epsilon = k_{1,j} - \sigma_1\epsilon,$$

yielding scenario B. Recall from Section 2 that $D(t) = B(t)^{-1}$. If $j_1 = 0$ then $k_{1,j} = \epsilon$. We do not close the short position in this case and we get that $\phi^0 = 4\epsilon \geq k_{1,j} - \sigma_1\epsilon$, so we also get to scenario B.

For the induction step we split the proof into two parts. In part A we will assume that at the end of period t we are in scenario A, and in part B we will assume that at the end of period t we are in scenario B.

Part A: We will show that at the end of period $t+1$ we can end up either in situation A or B. First we assume that $j_t, i_{t-1} > 1$, and so both expressions in (4.2) with maturity t denote options (and not the underlying). Under these assumptions ϕ_t^0 satisfies

$$\phi_t^0 \geq D(t)\big(S_t^C - K_{t,i}\big)^+ - D(t)\big(S_t^C - K_{t,j}\big)^+.$$

Clearly, if $K_{t,i} \leq K_{t,j}$ or if both options expire out of the money, then $\phi_t^0 \geq 0$, and we are in situation A at the end of period $t+1$. So suppose that $K_{t,i} > K_{t,j}$ and that $S_t^C > K_{t,j}$. This also implies that $\sigma_t = 1$. If this is the case, we go short in one unit of the underlying, and ϕ_t^0 can be bounded from below as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_t^0 &\geq D(t)\big(S_t^C - K_{t,i}\big)^+ - D(t)\big(S_t^C - K_{t,j}\big) + D(t)\underline{S}_t \\ &\geq k_{t,j} - \epsilon\sigma_t.\end{aligned}$$

This corresponds to situation B. Next assume that $j_t = 0$ and $i_t > 0$. Then we have that $k_{t,j} = \epsilon$. At time t we end up in scenario B:

$$\phi_t^0 \geq D(t)\big(S_t^C - K_{t,j}\big)^+ + 2\epsilon \geq k_{t,j} - \epsilon\sigma_t.$$

We proceed with the case that $j_t > 0$ and $i_{t-1} = 0$. Since $k_{t,j} > \epsilon$, we can close the long position in the underlying and end up in scenario A at time t:

$$\phi_t^0 \geq D(t)\underline{S}_t - D(t)\big(S_t^C - K_{t,j}\big)^+ \geq 0.$$

The case where $j_t = i_{t-1} = 0$ is easily handled since the long and the short position simply cancel out. We are done with part A.

Part B: Assume that at the end of period t we are in scenario B, and thus $\phi_{t-1}^0 = k_{t-1,j} - \epsilon\sigma_{t-1}$. First we will consider the case where $j_t, i_{t-1} > 1$. If at time t the option with strike $K_{t,j}$ expires in the money, we do not close the short position and have

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_t^0 &\geq \phi_{t-1}^0 + D(t)\big(S_t^C - K_{t,i}\big)^+ - D(t)\big(S_t^C - K_{t,j}\big) \\ &= k_{t-1,j} - \epsilon\sigma_{t-1} + k_{t,j} - k_{t,i} \\ &\geq k_{t,j} - \epsilon\sigma_t,\end{aligned}$$

which means that we end up in scenario B. Now we distinguish two cases according to $x_{t-1} \leq x_t$ and $x_{t-1} > x_t$, and always assume that $C_t(K_{t,j})$ expires out of the money. If $x_{t-1} \leq x_t$, then we also have that $k_{t,i} \leq k_{t,j}$ and that $\sigma_t = -1$. We close the short position to end up in scenario A:

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_t^0 &\geq \phi_{t-1}^0 + D(t)\big(S_t^C - K_{t,i}\big)^+ - D(t)\overline{S}_t \\ &\geq k_{t,i} - \epsilon\sigma_t - k_{t,i} - \epsilon \geq 0.\end{aligned}$$

If on the other hand $x_{t-1} > x_t$ and $\sigma_t = 1$, we do not trade at time t to stay in scenario B:

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_t^0 &\geq \phi_{t-1}^0 + D(t)\big(S_t^C - K_{t,i}\big)^+ \\ &> k_{t,j} - \epsilon\sigma_t.\end{aligned}$$

We proceed with the case where $j_t = 0$ and $i_t > 0$. As before, we have $k_{t,j} = \epsilon$, and we can close one short position to stay in scenario B:

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_t^0 &= \phi_{t-1}^0 + D(t)\big(S_t^C - K_{t,i}\big)^+ + 2\epsilon - D(t)\overline{S}_t \\ &\geq k_{t-1,j} - \epsilon\sigma_{t-1} - k_{t,i} + \epsilon \\ &\geq \epsilon - \epsilon\sigma_t = k_{t,j} - \epsilon\sigma_t.\end{aligned}$$

If $j_t > 0$ and $i_{t-1} = 0$, then we distinguish two cases: either $C_t(K_{t,j})$ expires out of the money, in which case we cancel out the long and short position in the underlying and have:

$$\phi_t^0 \geq \phi_{t-1}^0 \geq 0,$$

which corresponds to scenario A. Or, $C_t(K_{t,j})$ expires in the money. Then we sell one unit of the underlying and hence we end up in scenario B:

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_t^0 &\geq \phi_{t-1}^0 - D(t)\big(S_t^C - K_{t,j}\big) + D(t)\underline{S}_t \\ &\geq k_{t-1,j} - \epsilon\sigma_{t-1} + k_{t,j} - \epsilon \\ &\geq k_{t,j} - \epsilon\sigma_t.\end{aligned}$$

In the last inequality we have used that $k_{t-1,j} - \epsilon\sigma_{t-1} = x_{t-1} \geq k_{t,i} - \epsilon\sigma_t$, and that $k_{t,i} = \epsilon$.

The case where $j_t = i_{t-1} = 0$ is again easy to handle, since the long and the short position cancel out and we are in scenario B at the end of the $(t+1)$-st period.

Thus at time u we are either in scenario A or scenario B, which proves the assertion if $\sigma_1 = -1$.

The proof for $\sigma_1 = 1$ is similar. We will first show that at the end of the second period we can either be in scenario A or scenario B, and the statement of the proposition then follows by induction exactly as in the case $\sigma_1 = -1$.

First we assume that $j_1 > 0$. Then, if the option $C_1(K_{1,j})$ expires out of the money, we are in scenario A; otherwise we go short in the underlying and have

$$\phi_1^0 \geq -D(1)\big(S_1^C - K_{1,j}\big) + D(1)\underline{S}_1 \geq k_{1,j} - \epsilon,$$

which corresponds to scenario B. If $j_1 = 0$, then we also have that $k_{j,1} = \epsilon$, and hence we are in scenario B. □

According to Lemma 4.2, there is a semi-static, self-financing trading strategy Φ for the buyer of the contract $-CVB_u(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{I}, \boldsymbol{J})$, such that (ϕ_u^0, ϕ_u^1) only depends on $\sigma_u, k_{u,j}$ (the investor might have some surplus in the bank account). In the following we will use this strategy and only write $-CVB_u(\sigma_u, k_{u,j})$ resp. $\underline{r}_u^{CVB}(\sigma_u, k_{u,j})$ instead of $-CVB_u(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{I}, \boldsymbol{J})$ resp. $\underline{r}_u^{CVB}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{I}, \boldsymbol{J})$. In the case where $\phi_u^0 \geq 0$ and $\phi_u^1 = 0$ we will say that the calendar vertical basket expires out of the money; otherwise we will say that it expires in the money.

The next theorem states necessary conditions for the absence of arbitrage in markets with spread-bound $\epsilon \geq 0$.

Theorem 4.3. *Let $\epsilon \geq 0$, $s, t, u \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $s < t$ and $s < u$ and $i \in \{0, \ldots, N_t\}$, $j \in \{0, \ldots, N_s\}$, $l \in \{0, \ldots, N_u\}$. Fix prices as at the beginning of Section 2, with $k_{t,1} > \epsilon$ for all $t \in \mathcal{T}$. Then, for all calendar vertical baskets with maturity $s \in \mathcal{T}$ and parameters $k_{s,j}$ and σ_s, the following conditions are necessary for ϵ-consistency:*

(i)

$$\frac{\underline{r}_s^{CVB}(\sigma_s, k_{s,j}) - \overline{r}_{t,i}}{\big(k_{s,j} - \epsilon\sigma_s\big) - \big(k_{t,i} + \epsilon\big)} \leq \frac{\overline{r}_{u,l} - \underline{r}_s^{CVB}(\sigma_s, k_{s,j})}{k_{u,l} + \epsilon - \big(k_{s,j} - \epsilon\sigma_s\big)}, \quad \text{if} \quad k_{t,i} + \epsilon < k_{s,j} - \epsilon\sigma_s < k_{u,l} + \epsilon, \tag{4.3}$$

(ii)

$$\frac{\overline{r}_{u,l} - \underline{r}_s^{CVB}(\sigma_s, k_{s,j})}{k_{u,l} + \epsilon - \big(k_{s,j} - \epsilon\sigma_s\big)} \geq -1, \quad \text{if} \quad k_{s,j} - \epsilon\sigma_s < k_{u,l} + \epsilon, \tag{4.4}$$

(iii)

$$\underline{r}_s^{CVB}(\sigma_s, k_{s,j}) - \overline{r}_{t,i} \leq 0, \quad \text{if} \quad k_{s,j} - \epsilon\sigma_s \geq k_{t,i} + \epsilon, \tag{4.5}$$

(iv)

$$\underline{r}_s^{CVB}(\sigma_s, k_{s,j}) - \overline{r}_{t,i} = 0 \;\Rightarrow\; \overline{r}_{t,i} = 0, \quad \textit{if} \quad k_{s,j} - \epsilon\sigma_s > k_{t,i} + \epsilon. \tag{4.6}$$

Proof. We will assume that $s < t \leq u$ and that $i, l > 0$. The other cases can be dealt with similarly. In all four cases *(i)*-*(iv)* we will assume that until time s we followed the trading strategy described in Lemma 4.2.

(i) If (4.3) fails we set

$$\theta = \frac{k_{u,l} + \epsilon - \big(k_{s,j} - \epsilon\sigma_s\big)}{k_{u,l} - k_{t,i}} \in (0,1)$$

and buy $\theta C_t(K_{t,i}) + (1-\theta)C_u(K_{u,l}) - CVB_s(\sigma_s, K_{s,j})$, making an initial profit. If the calendar vertical basket $CVB_s(\sigma_s, K_{s,j})$ expires out of the money, then we have model-independent arbitrage. Otherwise we have a short position in the underlying at time s. In order to close the short position, we buy θ units of the underlying at time t, and we buy $1-\theta$ units of the underlying at time u. The liquidation value of this strategy at time u is then non-negative:

$$\begin{aligned}
&(k_{s,j} - \epsilon\sigma_s + \epsilon)B(u) + \theta(S_t^C - K_{t,i})^+ \frac{B(u)}{B(t)} + (1-\theta)(S_u^C - K_{u,l})^+ \\
&\qquad + (\underline{S}_s - S_s^C)\frac{B(u)}{B(s)} - \theta\overline{S}_t\frac{B(u)}{B(t)} - (1-\theta)\overline{S}_u \\
&\qquad \geq (k_{s,j} - \epsilon\sigma_s)B(u) + \theta\frac{B(u)}{B(t)}\Big(S_t^C - K_{t,i} - \overline{S}_t\Big) + (1-\theta)\Big(S_u^C - K_{u,l} - \overline{S}_u\Big) \\
&\qquad \geq \Big(k_{s,j} - \epsilon\sigma_s - \theta k_{t,i} - (1-\theta)k_{u,l} - \epsilon\Big)B(u) = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

(ii) Next, assume that (4.4) fails. Then buying the contract

$$C_u(K_{u,l}) - CVB_s(\sigma_s, K_{s,j}) + k_{u,l} + \epsilon - (k_{s,j} - \epsilon\sigma_s)$$

earns an initial profit. If $CVB_s(\sigma_s, K_{s,j})$ expires out of the money, then we leave the portfolio as it is. Otherwise we immediately enter a short position and close it at time u. The liquidation value is then non-negative:

$$\begin{aligned}
&(k_{s,j} - \epsilon\sigma_s + \epsilon)B(u) + (\underline{S}_s - S_s^C)\frac{B(u)}{B(s)} + (S_u^C - K_{u,l})^+ - \overline{S}_u \\
&\qquad + \Big(k_{u,l} + \epsilon - (k_{s,j} - \epsilon\sigma_s)\Big)B(u) \geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

(iii) If (4.5) fails, then we buy the contract $C_t(K_{t,i}) - CVB_s(\sigma_s, k_{s,j})$ for negative cost. Again we can focus on the case where $CVB_s(\sigma_s, k_{s,j})$ expires in the money. We sell one unit of the underlying at time s and close the short position at time t. The liquidation value of this strategy at time t is non-negative:

$$(k_{s,j} - \epsilon\sigma_s + \epsilon)B(t) + (\underline{S}_s - S_s^C)\frac{B(t)}{B(s)} + (S_t^C - K_{t,j})^+ - \overline{S}_t \geq 0.$$

(iv) We will show that there cannot exist an ϵ-consistent model, if (4.6) fails. In every model where the probability that $CVB_s(\sigma_s, k_{s,j})$ expires in the money is zero, we could simply sell $CVB_s(\sigma_s, k_{s,j})$ and follow the trading strategy from Lemma 4.2, realising (model-dependent) arbitrage. On the other hand, if $CVB_s(\sigma_s, k_{s,j})$ expires in the money with positive probability, then we can use the same strategy as in the proof of *(iii)*. At time t the liquidation value of the portfolio is positive with positive probability. □

Note that if $\epsilon = 0$ then $CVB_s(\sigma_s, k_{s,j})$ has the same payoff as $-C_s(K_{s,j})$. Keeping this in mind, it is easy to verify that the conditions from Theorem 4.3 are a generalisation of equations (4), (5) and (6) in [5].

5 Multiple maturities: Necessary and sufficient conditions under simplifying assumptions

It remains open whether the conditions from Theorem 4.3 together with the conditions for each single maturity (as given in Theorem 3.1) are sufficient for the existence of ϵ-consistent models or not. As a first step towards this problem, in Theorem 5.3 we will state necessary and sufficient conditions which guarantee the existence of ϵ-consistent models under simplifying assumptions:

Assumption 5.1. *(i) For all maturities $1 \leq t \leq T$, options with all (discounted) strikes $k \in \mathbb{R}$ are traded.*

(ii) For each option, bid and ask price agree. We will write $R_t(k)$ for the price of an option with strike $B(t)k$ and maturity t.

(iii) For all $t \in \mathcal{T}$ the function $k \mapsto R_t(k)$ is a call function and the associated measure μ_t has finite support which is contained in $[\epsilon, \infty)$.

(iv) The initial bid-ask spread on the underlying is zero, i.e. $\underline{S}_0 = \overline{S}_0 = S_0$ and $\mathbb{E}\mu_t \in [S_0 - \epsilon, S_0 + \epsilon]$.

Note that, for convenience, we have slightly changed the notation from Sections 2 and 3: the option prices are now denoted by $R_t(k)$ instead of $r_{t,i}$. If $k \mapsto R_t(k)$ is not a call function, then the prices cannot be consistent with the absence of arbitrage (see Theorem 3.1). Semi-static portfolios are defined as in Section 2, involving finitely many call options. In order to construct arbitrage-free models under Assumption 5.1, we now recall the main result of [9], which gives a criterion for the existence of the peacock (ν_t) from Lemma 2.10. Recall also the notation $W^\infty, \mathcal{M}$ introduced before Definition 2.9. According to Proposition 3.2 in [9], for $\epsilon > 0$, a measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$, and $m \in [\mathbb{E}\mu - \epsilon, \mathbb{E}\mu + \epsilon]$, the set

$$\{\nu \in \mathcal{M} : W^\infty(\mu, \nu) \leq \epsilon,\ \mathbb{E}\nu = m\}$$

has a smallest and a largest element, and their respective call functions can be expressed by the call function R_μ of μ (see (2.12)) as follows:

$$R_\mu^{\min}(x; m, \epsilon) = \Big(m + R_\mu(x - \epsilon) - \big(\mathbb{E}\mu + \epsilon\big)\Big) \vee R_\mu(x + \epsilon),$$
$$R_\mu^{\max}(x; m, \epsilon) = \operatorname{conv}\Big(m + R_\mu(\cdot + \epsilon) - \big(\mathbb{E}\mu - \epsilon\big), R_\mu(\cdot - \epsilon)\Big)(x),$$

where conv denotes the convex hull. The main theorem of [9] gives an equivalent condition for the existence of a peacock within W^∞-distance ϵ of a given sequence of measures:

Theorem 5.2. *(Theorem 3.5 in [9]) Let $\epsilon > 0$ and $(\mu_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in $\mathcal{M}$ such that*

$$I := \bigcap_{n\in\mathbb{N}} [\mathbb{E}\mu_n - \epsilon, \mathbb{E}\mu_n + \epsilon]$$

is not empty. Denote by $(R_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ the corresponding call functions. Then there exists a peacock $(\nu_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that

$$W^\infty(\mu_n, \nu_n) \leq \epsilon, \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}, \tag{5.1}$$

if and only if for some $m \in I$ and for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $x_1, \dots, x_N \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$R_1^{\min}(x_1; m, \epsilon) + \sum_{n=2}^{N} \Big(R_n(x_n + \epsilon\sigma_n) - R_n(x_{n-1} + \epsilon\sigma_n) \Big) \leq R_{N+1}^{\max}(x_N; m, \epsilon). \tag{5.2}$$

Here, $\sigma_n = \operatorname{sgn}(x_{n-1} - x_n)$ depends on x_{n-1} and x_n. In this case it is possible to choose $\mathbb{E}\nu_1 = \mathbb{E}\nu_2 = \cdots = m$.

Assumption 5.1 allow us to circumvent many problems, as we only have to check whether the family $(\mu_t)_{t\in\mathcal{T}}$ satisfies the condition from Theorem 5.2. The conditions in Theorem 5.3 can be directly derived from (5.2). Note that in our case $m = S_0$ and $\mathbb{E}\mu_t = R_t(\epsilon) + \epsilon$.

Theorem 5.3. *Let $\epsilon \geq 0$. Then, under Assumption 5.1, the following conditions are necessary and sufficient for the the existence of ϵ-consistent models: for all $u \in \{2, \dots, T\}$ and for all real $k_1, \dots, k_{u-1}$,*

(i)

$$\sum_{t=1}^{u-1} \Big(R_{t+1}\big(k_t + \epsilon\sigma_{t+1}\big) - R_t\big(k_t + \epsilon\sigma_t\big) \Big) + R_1(\epsilon) - R_u(\epsilon) + 2\epsilon \geq 0, \tag{5.3}$$

where $\sigma_1 = -1$ and $\sigma_u = 1$.

(ii)

$$\sum_{t=1}^{u-1} \Big(R_{t+1}\big(k_t + \epsilon\sigma_{t+1}\big) - R_t\big(k_t + \epsilon\sigma_t\big) \Big) + R_1(\epsilon) - S_0 + 2\epsilon \geq 0, \tag{5.4}$$

where $\sigma_1 = -1$ and $\sigma_u = -1$.

(iii)

$$\sum_{t=1}^{u-1} \Big(R_{t+1}\big(k_t + \epsilon\sigma_{t+1}\big) - R_t\big(k_t + \epsilon\sigma_t\big) \Big) + S_0 - R_u(\epsilon) \geq 0, \tag{5.5}$$

where $\sigma_1 = 1$ and $\sigma_u = 1$.

(iv)

$$\sum_{t=1}^{u-1} \Big(R_{t+1}\big(k_t + \epsilon\sigma_{t+1}\big) - R_t\big(k_t + \epsilon\sigma_t\big) \Big) \geq 0, \tag{5.6}$$

where $\sigma_1 = 1$ and $\sigma_u = -1$.

Here we set $\sigma_t = \operatorname{sgn}(k_{t-1} - k_t)$.

Proof. We will first show that there is model-independent arbitrage with respect to spread-bound ϵ if any of the above conditions fail. We will assume that $u = T$. Throughout the first part of the proof we fix $k_1, \dots k_{T-1} \in \mathbb{R}$ and set $K_t = B(t)k_t$ and $\epsilon_t = B(t)\epsilon$, for $t \in \mathcal{T}$.

(i) If (5.3) fails, we buy the contract

$$2\epsilon + \sum_{t=1}^{T} \Big(C_t\big(k_{t-1}B(t) + \epsilon_t\sigma_t\big) - C_t\big(K_t + \epsilon_t\sigma_t\big) \Big),$$

where $k_0 = k_T = 0$ and $\sigma_t = \operatorname{sgn}(k_{t-1} - k_t)$, making an initial profit. Therefore, we will construct a semi-static trading strategy Φ, and ϕ_t^0 will again denote the number of bank account units held by the investor at time $t \in \mathcal{T}$. We will show inductively that for all $t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$ we either have that $\phi_t^0 \geq k_t$ – which we will refer to as scenario A′ – or we can have a long position the underlying asset S and $\phi_t^0 \geq 0$, to which we will refer as scenario B′. We start with $t = 1$. If both options with maturity $t = 1$ expire in the money, then we do not trade and hence

$$\phi_1^0 = D(1)(S_1^C - \epsilon_1) - D(1)(S_1^C - K_1 + \epsilon_1) + 2\epsilon = k_1,$$

which corresponds to scenario A′. If on the other hand $S_1^C \leq K_1 - \epsilon_1$, then we get the amount $S_1^C + \epsilon_1$ transferred to our bank account, which is enough to buy the underlying asset for $\overline{S}_1 \leq S_1^C + \epsilon_1$.

Now suppose that at the end of the t-th period we are in scenario A′. If both options with maturity t expire in the money, then $\phi_t^0 \geq k_t$, and we finish the $t+1$-th period in scenario A′. So assume that $k_{t-1} \leq k_t$, and that at least one option is out of the money. Then $S_t^C \leq K_t - \epsilon_t$, in which case we have enough money to buy the underlying for $\overline{S}_t$ and end up in scenario B′:

$$\phi_t^0 \geq k_{t-1} + D(t)\big(S_t^C - B(t)k_{t-1} + \epsilon_t\big)^+ - D(t)\overline{S}_t \geq 0.$$

Next, if $k_{t-1} \geq k_t$ and both options with maturity t expire out of the money, then $\phi_t^0 \geq k_{t-1} \geq k_t$. So we only have to check the case where $k_{t-1} + \epsilon \leq D(t)S_t^C \leq k_t + \epsilon$:

$$\phi_t^0 \geq k_{t-1} - D(t)\big(S_t^C - K_t - \epsilon_t\big) \geq k_t.$$

Now assume that at the end of the t-th period we are in situation B′. If $k_{t-1} \leq k_t$, then the cashflow generated by the two options with maturity t is non-negative, and we stay in scenario B′. If on the other hand $k_{t-1} > k_t$, then we sell the underlying for $\underline{S}_t$ and obtain $\phi_t^0 \geq k_t$, which can be seen similarly as in the previous step by differentiating cases. This completes the first part of the proof.

(ii) If (5.4) is violated, then buying the contract

$$2\epsilon + \sum_{t=1}^{T-1}\Big(C_t\big(k_{t-1}B(t) + \epsilon_t\sigma_t\big) - C_t\big(K_t + \epsilon_t\sigma_t\big)\Big) + C_T\big(k_{T-1}B(T) - \epsilon_T\big) - S,$$

where $k_0 = 0$, earns an initial profit. Following the same strategy as in *(i)* yields a model-independent arbitrage strategy.

(iii) If (5.5) fails, then we buy the contract

$$S - C_1(K_1 + \epsilon_1) + \sum_{t=2}^{T}\Big(C_t\big(k_{t-1}B(t) + \epsilon_t\sigma_t\big) - C_t\big(K_t + \epsilon_t\sigma_t\big)\Big),$$

where $k_T = 0$, making an initial profit. Whenever $C_1(K_1 + \epsilon_1)$ expires out of the money, we still have the underlying, whereas if $S_1^C \geq K_1 + \epsilon_1$, then we sell one unit of the underlying, yielding $\phi_1^0 \geq k_1$. The rest can be done by induction, as in part *(i)*.

(iv) If (5.6) fails, then buying the contract

$$-C_1(K_1 + \epsilon_1) + \sum_{t=2}^{T-1}\Big(C_t\big(k_{t-1}B(t) + \epsilon_t\sigma_t\big) - C_t\big(K_t + \epsilon_t\sigma_t\big)\Big) + C_T\big(k_{T-1}B(T) - \epsilon_T\big)$$

earns an initial profit. We will show inductively that at the end of the $t+1$-th period, $t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$, it is possible to have either $\phi_t^0 \geq 0$, or to have $\phi_t^0 \geq k_t$ and be short one unit of the

underlying asset. These two scenarios are exactly scenario A resp. scenario B from the proof of Lemma 4.2. We start with $t = 1$. If $C_1(K_1 + \epsilon_1)$ expires out of the money, then the former condition is satisfied; otherwise we short-sell one unit of the asset. Thus, we get

$$\phi_1^0 = D(1)\underline{S}_1 - D(1)(S_1^C - K_1 - \epsilon_1) \geq k_1.$$

Now suppose that at the end of the t-th period we are in scenario A. If $k_{t-1} \leq k_t$, then the cashflow generated by the two options with maturity t is non-negative and we stay in scenario A. If on the other hand $k_t \leq k_{t-1}$, we sell one unit of the underlying at the end of period $t+1$. The corresponding trading strategy satisfies

$$\phi_t^0 \geq D(t)\big(S_t^C - B(t)k_{t-1} - \epsilon_t\big)^+ - D(t)\big(S_t^C - K_t - \epsilon_t\big)^+ + D(t)\underline{S}_t \geq k_t.$$

Now assume that at the end of the t-th period we are in situation B, meaning that we have a short position in the underlying and hold at least k_{t-1} units of the bank account. Then, if both options with maturity t are in the money, we do not trade, and $\phi_t^0 \geq k_t$. Otherwise we close the short position and finish in scenario A. At time T we have model-independent arbitrage, which can be seen similarly as in the previous steps.

If all four conditions hold, then we can use the fact that $\mathbb{E}\mu_t = R_t(\epsilon) + \epsilon$ to conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}&\max\Big\{R_1(k_1 - \epsilon) + S_0 - (\mathbb{E}\mu_1 + \epsilon), R_1(k_1 + \epsilon)\Big\} + \sum_{t=2}^{u-1}\Big(R_t(k_t + \epsilon\sigma_t) - R_t(k_{t-1} + \epsilon\sigma_t)\Big)\\ &\quad\leq \min\Big\{R_u(k_{u-1} + \epsilon) + S_0 - (\mathbb{E}\mu_u - \epsilon), R_u(k_{u-1} - \epsilon)\Big\}.\end{aligned}$$

An inspection of the proof of Theorem 5.2 (i.e., Theorem 3.5 in [9]) easily shows that there exists a peacock $(\nu_t)_{t\in\mathcal{T}}$ with mean S_0 such that

$$W^\infty(\mu_t, \nu_t) \leq \epsilon, \quad t \in \mathcal{T}.$$

By Lemma 2.10 the prices are then ϵ-consistent with the absence of arbitrage. □

6 Multiple maturities: consistency

As mentioned in the introduction, our main goal is to find the least bound on the underlying's bid-ask spread that allows to reproduce given option prices. The following result clarifies the situation if *no* such bound is imposed (see also Example 2.3). In our wording, we now seek conditions for consistency (Definition 2.2) and not ϵ-consistency (Definition 2.4). By enlarging the class of models, the no-arbitrage conditions become looser. In particular, we do not have any intertemporal conditions. Recall the notation used in Theorem 3.1, where $i = 0$ is allowed in (3.1)-(3.4), inducing a dependence of these conditions on $\underline{S}_0$ and $\overline{S}_0$. In the following proposition, on the other hand, we require $i, j, l \geq 1$, and therefore the current bid and ask prices of the underlying are irrelevant when checking consistency of option prices. Thus, the notion of ϵ-consistency seems to make more sense than consistency.

Proposition 6.1. *The prices (2.1)-(2.4) are consistent with the absence of arbitrage (see Definition 2.2) if and only if, for all $t \in \mathcal{T}$, the conditions (3.1)-(3.4) from Theorem 3.1 hold for $i, j, l \in \{1, \dots, N_t\}$.*

Proof. By Theorem 3.1 these conditions are necessary. Now fix $t \in \mathcal{T}$ and assume that the conditions hold. Exactly as in the sufficiency proof of Theorem 3.1, we can construct $e_{t,1}, e_{t,2}, \dots, e_{t,N_t}$ such that $e_{t,i} \in [\underline{r}_{t,i}, \overline{r}_{t,i}]$. The linear interpolation L_t of the points $(k_{t,i}, e_{t,i})_{i\in\{1,\dots,N_t\}}$ can then be extended to a call function of a measure μ_t (see the final part of the sufficiency proof of Theorem 3.1).

We define random variables S_t^C such that the law of $D(t)S_t^C$ is given by μ_t. Then we have that

$$D(t)\mathbb{E}[(S_t^C - K_{t,i})^+] = e_{t,i} \in [\underline{r}_{t,i}, \overline{r}_{t,i}], \quad i \in \{1, \dots N_t\}.$$

Furthermore, we pick $s \in [\underline{S}_0, \overline{S}_0]$ and set $\nu_t = \delta_s$ (Dirac delta) for all $t \in \mathcal{T}$. Clearly, $(\nu_t)_{t\in\mathcal{T}}$ is a peacock, and we set $S_t^* = B(t)s$, which implies $D(t)S_t^* \sim \nu_t$. Finally, we define $\underline{S}_t = S_t^* \wedge S_t^C$ and $\overline{S}_t = S_t^* \vee S_t^C$, and have thus constructed an arbitrage free model. □

It turns out that the conditions of Theorem 3.1 are implied by an even weaker notion of no-arbitrage, where the spread bound has to hold only with a certain probability:

Theorem 6.2. *Let $p \in (0, 1]$ and $\epsilon \geq 0$. For given prices (2.1)-(2.4) the following are equivalent:*

- *The prices satisfy Definition 2.4 (ϵ-consistency), but with (2.6) replaced by the weaker condition*
$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\overline{S}_t - \underline{S}_t \geq \epsilon B(t)\Big) \leq p, \quad t \in \mathcal{T}.$$
- *For all $t \in \mathcal{T}$ conditions (3.1)-(3.4) from Theorem 3.1 hold for $i, j, l \in \{1, \dots, N_t\}$.*

For the proof of Theorem 6.2 we employ a variant of Strassen's theorem for the modified Prokhorov distance.

Definition 6.3. For $p \in [0, 1]$ and two probability measures μ, ν on $\mathbb{R}$, we define the *modified Prokhorov distance* as

$$d_p^{\mathrm{P}}(\mu, \nu) := \inf\Big\{h > 0 : \nu(A) \leq \mu(A^h) + p, \text{ for all closed sets } A \subseteq \mathbb{R}\Big\}.$$

(To define the standard Prokhorov distance, replace p by h in the right-hand side.) A well known result, which was first proved by Strassen, and was then extended by Dudley [8, 15], explains the connection of d_p^{P} to minimal distance couplings:

Proposition 6.4. *Given measures μ, ν on $\mathbb{R}$, $p \in [0, 1]$, and $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with random variables $X \sim \mu$ and $Y \sim \nu$ such that*

$$\mathbb{P}\big(|X - Y| > \epsilon\big) \leq p, \tag{6.1}$$

if and only if

$$d_p^{\mathrm{P}}(\mu, \nu) \leq \epsilon. \tag{6.2}$$

The following theorem ("Strassen's theorem for the modified Prokhorov distance") is proved in Section 8 of [9].

Theorem 6.5. *Let $(\mu_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in $\mathcal{M}$, $\epsilon > 0$, and $p \in (0, 1]$. Then, for all $m \in \mathbb{R}$ there exists a peacock $(\nu_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ with mean m such that*

$$d_p^{\mathrm{P}}(\mu_n, \nu_n) \leq \epsilon.$$

Proof of Theorem 6.2. By Theorem 3.1, the second assertion implies the first one. To show the other implication, we define probability measures $(\mu_t)_{t\in\mathcal{T}}$ as in the proof of Proposition 6.1, such that $R_{\mu_t}(k_{t,i}) \in [\underline{r}_{t,i}, \overline{r}_{t,i}]$ for $i \in \{1,\dots N_t\}$ and $t \in \mathcal{T}$. Now we pick $s \in [\underline{S}_0, \overline{S}_0]$. Then by Theorem 6.5 there exists a peacock $(\nu_t)_{t\in\mathcal{T}}$ with mean s such that $d_p^{\mathrm{P}}(\mu_t, \nu_t) \le \epsilon$ for all $t \in \mathcal{T}$. We can then use Proposition 6.4 to conclude that there exist stochastic processes $(\widetilde{S}_t^C)_{t\in\mathcal{T}}$ and $(\widetilde{S}_t^*)_{t\in\mathcal{T}}$ whose marginal distributions are given by $(\mu_t)_{t\in\mathcal{T}}$ resp. $(\nu_t)_{t\in\mathcal{T}}$, such that $(\widetilde{S}_t^*)_{t\in\mathcal{T}}$ is a martingale and such that

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\big|\widetilde{S}_t^* - \widetilde{S}_t^C\big| \ge \epsilon\Big) \le p, \quad t \in \mathcal{T}.$$

We then simply put

$$S_t^* = B(t)\widetilde{S}_t^*, \quad S_t^C = B(t)\widetilde{S}_t^C, \quad \underline{S}_t = S_t^* \wedge S_t^C, \quad \text{and } \overline{S}_t = S_t^* \vee S_t^C.$$

□

7 Conclusion

We define the notion of ϵ-consistent prices, meaning that a set of bid and ask prices for call options and the underlying can be explained by a model with bid-ask spread bounded by ϵ. For a single maturity, we solve the ϵ-consistency problem, recovering the trichotomy consistency/weak arbitrage/model-independent arbitrage from the frictionless case [6]. The multi-period problem seems to be rather difficult. As a first step, we provide two results: Necessary conditions, and equivalent conditions under simplified assumptions. The latter result (Section 5) is of some mathematical appeal, as it invokes a recent generalization of a classical probabilistic theorem due to Strassen [9]. We leave the general multi-period problem, with a spread on both the options and the underlying, to future research.

A Proof of Theorem 3.1

We first show that the conditions are necessary. Throughout the proof we will denote the option $C_1(K_{1,i})$ by C^i to ease notation.

(i) Suppose that $1 \le i < j < l$ are such that (3.1) does not hold. We buy a butterfly spread, which is the contract

$$BF^{i,j,l} = \frac{1}{K_j - K_i}C^i + \frac{1}{K_l - K_j}C^l - \Big(\frac{1}{K_j - K_i} + \frac{1}{K_l - K_j}\Big)C^j$$

and get an initial payment. Its payoff at maturity is positive if S_1^C expires in the interval (K_i, K_l) and zero otherwise, and so we have model-independent arbitrage.

If (3.1) fails for $i = 0$ we buy the contract

$$BF^{0,j,l} = \frac{1}{K_j - B\epsilon}S + \frac{1}{K_l - K_j}C^l - \Big(\frac{1}{K_j - B\epsilon} + \frac{1}{K_l - K_j}\Big)C^j$$

and make an initial profit. At maturity the liquidation value of the contract is given by

$$\frac{1}{K_j - B\epsilon}\underline{S}_1 + \frac{1}{K_l - K_j}(S_1^C - K_l)^+ - \Big(\frac{1}{K_j - B\epsilon} + \frac{1}{K_l - K_j}\Big)(S_1^C - K_j)^+$$

which is always non-negative.

(ii) Suppose that (3.2) fails for $1 \leq i < l$. Then we buy a call spread $C^l - C^i$ and invest $k_l - k_i$ in the bank account. This earns an initial profit, and at maturity the cashflow generated by the options is at least $K_i - K_i$, which means that we have arbitrage. Now we consider the case where $i = 0$. Note that in this case (3.2) is equivalent to

$$\frac{\overline{r}_l - \underline{S}_0}{k_l + \epsilon} \geq -1.$$

If this fails we buy C^l, sell one unit of the underlying, and invest $k_l + \epsilon$ in the bank account. Again we earn an initial profit, and at maturity we close the short position and have thus constructed an arbitrage strategy.

(iii) If (3.3) fails for $0 < i < j$, then we buy the call spread $C^i - C^j$ and get an initial payment. Its payoff at maturity is always non-negative.

If (3.3) fails for $i = 0$, then we sell C^j and buy one unit of the stock, which also yields model-independent arbitrage.

(iv) We will show that we cannot find an arbitrage-free model for the given prices, if (3.4) fails. Proposition 3.2 states that there is a weak arbitrage opportunity in this case (which entails, according to Definition 2.8, that there is no model-independent arbitrage). In any model where $\mathbb{P}(S_1^C > K_j) = 0$ we could sell C^j. Since this option is never exercised, this yields arbitrage. If on the other hand $\mathbb{P}(S_1^C > K_j) > 0$ and $i > 0$, then we buy the call spread $C^i - C^j$ at zero cost. At maturity the probability that the options generate a positive cashflow is positive. If $i = 0$, then we buy the contract $S - C^j$ instead, and at maturity the liquidation value of the portfolio is given by $\underline{S}_1 - (S_1^C - K_j)$, which is positive with positive probability. This completes the proof of necessity.

Now we show that the conditions in Theorem 3.1 are sufficient for ϵ-consistency, using Lemma 2.10. We first argue that we may w.l.o.g. assume that $\overline{r}_N = \underline{r}_N = 0$. Indeed, we could choose

$$k_{N+1} \geq \max\left\{ \frac{\overline{r}_i k_j - \underline{r}_j k_i}{\overline{r}_i - \underline{r}_j} : \ 0 \leq i < j \leq N, \ \overline{r}_i - \underline{r}_j > 0 \right\} \vee \max\{k_j + \underline{r}_j : 0 \leq j \leq N\}$$

and set $\overline{r}_{N+1} = \underline{r}_{N+1} = 0$. Then all conditions from Theorem 3.1 would still hold, if we included an additional option with strike k_{N+1} and bid and ask price equal to zero. So from now on we assume that $\overline{r}_N = \underline{r}_N = 0$.

We will first show that, for $s \in \{0, \dots, N\}$, we can find $e_s \in [\underline{r}_s, \overline{r}_s]$ such that the linear interpolation L of the points $(k_s, e_s), s \in \{0, \dots, N\}$, is convex, decreasing, and such that the right derivative of L satisfies $L'(k_0) \geq -1$. Then we will extend L to a call function, and its associated measure will be the law of $D(1)S_1^C$. The sequence $(e_s)_{s \in \{1,\dots,N\}}$ can then be interpreted as shadow prices of the options with strikes $(k_s)_{s \in \{1,\dots,N\}}$.

Before we start we will introduce some notation. For $j, l \in \{1, \dots, N\}, j < l$ we denote the line connecting $(k_j, \underline{r}_j)$ and $(k_l, \overline{r}_l)$ by $f_{j,l}$, i.e.

$$f_{j,l}(x) = \underline{r}_j + \frac{\overline{r}_l - \underline{r}_j}{k_l - k_j} \cdot (x - k_j).$$

If e_s is known for some $s \in \{0 \dots, N\}$, then we denote the line connecting (k_s, e_s) and $(k_i, \overline{r}_i), i \in \{s+1, \dots, N\}$ by $g_{s,i}$, i.e.

$$g_{s,i}(x) = e_s + \frac{\overline{r}_i - e_s}{k_i - k_s} \cdot (x - k_s).$$

The linear interpolation of (k_s, e_s) and $(k_j, \underline{r}_j), j \in \{s+1, \dots, N\}$ will be denoted by $h_{s,j}$:

$$h_{s,j}(x) = e_s + \frac{\underline{r}_j - e_s}{k_j - k_s} \cdot (x - k_s).$$

We will refer to the slopes of these lines as $f'_{j,l}, g'_{s,i}$ and $h'_{s,j}$ respectively.

First we will construct e_0. In order to get all desired properties – this will become clear towards the end of the proof – e_0 has to satisfy

$$e_0 \geq \max_{0 \leq j < l \leq N} f_{j,l}(k_0), \tag{A.1}$$

and

$$e_0 \leq \min_{0 \leq i \leq N} (k_i + \overline{r}_i - k_0). \tag{A.2}$$

We will argue that we can pick such an e_0 by showing that

$$f_{j,l}(k_0) \leq k_i + \overline{r}_i - k_0, \quad i, j, l \in \{0, \dots, N\}, j \leq l. \tag{A.3}$$

Using (3.2) twice we can immediately see that (A.3) holds for $i \geq j$:

$$f_{j,l}(k_0) \leq \underline{r}_j + k_j - k_0 \leq \overline{r}_i + k_i - k_0.$$

If on the other hand $i < j$ we rewrite the right hand side of (A.3) to $h_i(k_0)$, where $h_i(x) = -x + \overline{r}_i + k_i$. Then from (3.1) we get that

$$f_{j,l}(k_i) \leq \overline{r}_i = h_i(k_i),$$

and since $f'_{j,l} \geq -1 = h'_i$ the inequality follows.

The above reasoning shows that existence of an e_0 such that (A.1) and (A.2) hold. Next we want to construct e_1 for given e_0. It has to satisfy the requirements

$$e_1 \geq \max_{1 \leq j < l \leq N} f_{j,l}(k_1) \vee (e_0 + k_0 - k_1) \tag{A.4}$$

and

$$e_1 \leq \min_{1 \leq i \leq N} g_{0,i}(k_1). \tag{A.5}$$

Again we will argue that we can pick such an e_1 by considering the corresponding inequalities. First note that the inequality

$$e_0 + k_0 - k_1 \leq g_{0,i}(k_1), \quad i \in \{1, \dots, N\},$$

follows directly from (A.1). Next we want to prove that

$$f_{j,l}(k_1) \leq g_{0,i}(k_1), \quad i, j, l \in \{1, \dots, N\}, j < l. \tag{A.6}$$

Therefore observe that

$$f_{j,l}(k_0) \leq e_0 = g_{0,i}(k_0).$$

If $i < j$ (A.6) follows from (3.1), since $f_{j,l}(k_i) \leq \overline{r}_i = g_{0,i}(k_i)$. For $i = j$ we may simply use the fact that $\underline{r}_i \leq \overline{r}_i$ and hence we get that $f_{j,l}(k_i) \leq \overline{r}_i = g_{0,i}(k_i)$. For $i > j$ we may use $f_{j,l}(k_0) \leq e_0 = h_{0,j}(k_0)$ to get

$$f_{j,l}(k_1) \leq h_{0,j}(k_1) \leq g_{0,i}(k_1),$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that $h_{0,j}(k_0) = g_{0,i}(k_0) = e_0$ and that

$$h'_{0,j} = \frac{\underline{r}_j - e_0}{k_j - k_0} \leq \frac{\overline{r}_i - e_0}{k_i - k_0} = g'_{0,i}.$$

In the last step we used that $e_0 \geq f_{j,i}(k_0)$.

Now suppose we have already constructed $e_1, \dots e_{s-1}, s \in 1, \dots, N$. Then for $r \in \{1, \dots s-1\}$ we have that

$$e_r \geq \left(e_{r-1} + \frac{e_{r-1} - e_{r-2}}{k_{r-1} - k_{r-2}} \cdot (k_r - k_{r-1}) \right) \vee \max_{r \leq j < l \leq N} f_{j,l}(k_r), \tag{A.7}$$

and

$$e_r \leq \min_{r \leq i \leq N} g_{r-1,i}(k_r). \tag{A.8}$$

Note that for $r = 1$ we need an appropriate e_{-1} and k_{-1} in order for (A.7) to hold. For instance, we can set $k_{-1} = -1$ and $e_{-1} = e_0 - (k_0 + 1) \cdot (e_1 - e_0)/(k_1 - k_0)$.

We want to show that we can choose e_s such that (A.7) and (A.8) hold for $r = s$. First, the inequality

$$e_{s-1} + \frac{e_{s-1} - e_{s-2}}{k_{s-1} - k_{s-2}} \cdot (k_s - k_{s-1}) \leq g_{s-1,i}(k_s), \quad i \in \{s, \dots, N\},$$

is equivalent to

$$\frac{e_{s-1} - e_{s-2}}{k_{s-1} - k_{s-2}} \leq \frac{\overline{r}_i - e_{s-1}}{k_i - k_{s-1}}$$

which is again equivalent to

$$e_{s-1} \leq g_{s-2,i}(k_{s-1})$$

and holds by (A.8).

The inequality

$$f_{j,l}(k_s) \leq g_{s-1,i}(k_s), \quad i, j, l \in \{s, \dots, N\}, j < l,$$

can be shown using the same arguments as before: first we note that $f_{j,l}(k_{s-1}) \leq e_{s-1} = g_{s-1,i}(k_s)$ and then we distinguish between $i < j$, $i = j$ and $i > j$.

We have now constructed a finite sequence $(e_s)_{s \in \{0,\dots,N\}}$. Observe that for all $s \in \{0, \dots, N\}$ the bounds on e_s from above, namely (A.1) and (A.2) for $s = 0$, (A.4) and (A.5) for $s = 1$ and (A.7) and (A.8) for $s > 1$, ensure that $e_s \in [\underline{r}_s, \overline{r}_s]$. Denote by $L : [k_0, k_N] \to \mathbb{R}$ the linear interpolation of the points $(k_s, e_s), s \in \{0, \dots, N\}$. Then L is convex, which is easily seen from

$$e_s \geq e_{s-1} + \frac{e_{s-1} - e_{s-2}}{k_{s-1} - k_{s-2}} \cdot (k_s - k_{s-1}), \quad s \geq 2.$$

Furthermore, by (A.4)

$$L'(k_0) = \frac{e_1 - e_0}{k_1 - k_0} \geq -1.$$

Finally, L is strictly decreasing on $\{L > 0\}$ which is most easily seen from $e_s \leq g_{s-1,N}(k_s)$. Therefore L can be extended to a call function R as follows (see Proposition 2.3 in [9]):

$$R(x) = \begin{cases} L(k_0) + k_0 - x, & x \leq k_0, \\ L(x), & x \in [k_0, k_N], \\ 0, & x \geq k_N. \end{cases}$$

Let μ be the associated measure. Then $\mathbb{E}\mu = R(0) = L(k_0) + k_0 \in [\underline{S}_0 - \epsilon, \overline{S}_0 + \epsilon]$. If $\mathbb{E}\mu < \underline{S}_0$ we define a measure ν by setting $\nu(A) = \mu(A - \epsilon)$ for Borel sets A. The set $A - \epsilon$ is defined as $\{a - \epsilon : a \in A\}$. Then $\mathbb{E}\nu = \mathbb{E}\mu + \epsilon \in [\underline{S}_0, \overline{S}_0]$. Similarly, if $\mathbb{E}\mu > \overline{S}_0$ we define $\nu(A) = \mu(A + \epsilon)$ for Borel sets A, and if $\mathbb{E}\mu \in [\underline{S}_0, \overline{S}_0]$ then we simply set $\nu = \mu$. Furthermore for $x < k_0$ we have that $R'(x) = -1$, therefore μ has support $[\epsilon, \infty)$. Clearly, by definition of ν, we have that $W^\infty(\mu, \nu) \leq \epsilon$. Hence, by Lemma 2.10 the prices are ϵ-consistent with the absence of arbitrage.

B Proof of Proposition 3.2

As we have seen in part (iv) of the necessity proof of Theorem 3.1 (see Appendix A), there is an arbitrage opportunity that depends on the null sets of the model. We will show that there is no model-independent arbitrage strategy. Suppose, on the contrary, that there is one. Then we can construct a portfolio $\phi_0^0 + \phi_0^1 S + \sum_{l=1}^N \phi^l C(K_l)$, where $\phi_0^0, \phi_0^1, \phi^l \in \mathbb{R}$, such that its initial cost is negative, i.e.

$$\phi_0^0 + \big((\phi_0^1)^+ \overline{S}_0 - (\phi_0^1)^- \underline{S}_0\big) + \sum_{l=1}^N \big((\phi^l)^+ \overline{r}_l - (\phi^l)^- \underline{r}_l\big) < 0,$$

and such that the liquidation value at maturity is non-negative, i.e.

$$\phi_0^0 B(1) + \big((\phi_0^1)^+ \overline{S}_1 - (\phi_0^1)^- \underline{S}_1\big) + \sum_{l=1}^N \phi^l (S_1^C - K_l)^+ \geq 0.$$

Without loss of generality we can assume that $|\phi_0^0| + |\phi_0^1| + \sum_{l=1}^N |\phi^l| = 1$.

Next we construct $e_0, \dots, e_N$ as in the sufficiency proof of Theorem 3.1. Clearly, we then have $\overline{r}_i = e_i = e_{i+1} = \dots = e_N$. The idea is to consider a market with slightly different shadow prices $\widetilde{e}_l$, which can be obtained from the original shadow prices e_l by shifting them down. More precisely, we set $l_0 = \max_{l \in \{0,\dots,N\}} (e_l + k_l = e_0 + k_0)$ and define

$$z = \min\left\{ -\frac{r_\Phi}{2},\ \big(e_{l_0+1} + k_{l_0+1} - e_{l_0} - k_{l_0}\big) \cdot \frac{\sum_{s=l_0}^N (k_s - k_{l_0})}{k_{l_0+1} - k_{l_0}},\ e_N \cdot \frac{\sum_{s=l_0}^N (k_s - k_{l_0})}{k_N - k_{l_0}} \right\},$$

and put $\widetilde{e}_l = e_l$ for $l \leq l_0$ and for $l > l_0$

$$\widetilde{e}_l = e_l - z \frac{k_l - k_{l_0}}{\sum_{s=l_0}^N (k_s - k_{l_0})}.$$

Now consider a modified set of prices, where bid and ask price of the l-th call, $0 \leq l \leq N$, are both defined by $\widetilde{e}_l$. It is easy to check that these prices satisfy all conditions from Theorem 3.1, and hence do not admit any arbitrage opportunities. Indeed, the second expression in the definition of z guarantees that e_{l_0+1} is not too small, i.e.

$$\frac{e_{l_0+1} - e_{l_0}}{k_{l_0+1} - k_{l_0}} \geq -1,$$

and the third expression ensures that $\widetilde{e}_N$ is not too small, i.e. $\widetilde{e}_N \geq 0$. A simple calculation

shows that

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_0^0 + \big((\phi_0^1)^+\overline{S}_0 - (\phi_0^1)^-\underline{S}_0\big) + \sum_{l=1}^N \phi^l \widetilde{e}_l &= \phi_0^0 + \big((\phi_0^1)^+\overline{S}_0 - (\phi_0^1)^-\underline{S}_0\big) + \sum_{l=1}^N \phi^l e_l - \sum_{l=l_0+1}^N \phi^l(e_l - \widetilde{e}_l)\\ &\leq r_\Phi - \sum_{l=l_0+1}^N \phi^l(e_l - \widetilde{e}_l)\\ &\leq r_\Phi + z\sum_{l=l_0+1}^N |\phi^l| \frac{k_l - k_{l_0}}{\sum_{s=l_0}^N (k_s - k_{l_0})}\\ &\leq r_\Phi + z \leq \frac{r_\Phi}{2} < 0,\end{aligned}$$

and so the portfolio C_Φ in the modified market has negative cost. But its liquidation value at maturity is unchanged and hence non-negative, and we have thus constructed a model-independent arbitrage strategy for the modified set of prices, which is a contradiction.

References

[1] M. Bichuch, *Pricing a contingent claim liability with transaction costs using asymptotic analysis for optimal investment*, Finance Stoch., 18 (2014), pp. 651–694.

[2] H. Buehler, *Expensive martingales*, Quant. Finance, 6 (2006), pp. 207–218.

[3] P. Carr and L. Cousot, *Explicit constructions of martingales calibrated to given implied volatility smiles*, SIAM J. Financial Math., 3 (2012), pp. 182–214.

[4] P. Carr and D. B. Madan, *A note on sufficient conditions for no arbitrage*, Finance Research Letters, 2 (2005), pp. 125–130.

[5] L. Cousot, *Conditions on option prices for absence of arbitrage and exact calibration*, Journal of Banking and Finance, 31 (2007), pp. 3377–3397.

[6] M. H. A. Davis and D. G. Hobson, *The range of traded option prices*, Math. Finance, 17 (2007), pp. 1–14.

[7] M. H. A. Davis, V. G. Panas, and T. Zariphopoulou, *European option pricing with transaction costs*, SIAM J. Control Optim., 31 (1993), pp. 470–493.

[8] R. M. Dudley, *Distances of probability measures and random variables*, Ann. Math. Statist, 39 (1968), pp. 1563–1572.

[9] S. Gerhold and I. C. Gülüm, *A variant of Strassen's theorem: Existence of martingales within a prescribed distance*. Preprint, available at http://arxiv.org/abs/1512.06640, 2015.

[10] P. Henry-Labordère, J. Obłój, P. Spoida, and N. Touzi, *The maximum maximum of a martingale with given n marginals*, Ann. Appl. Probab., 26 (2016), pp. 1–44.

[11] F. Hirsch, C. Profeta, B. Roynette, and M. Yor, *Peacocks and associated martingales, with explicit constructions*, vol. 3 of Bocconi & Springer Series, Springer, Milan; Bocconi University Press, Milan, 2011.

[12] Y. M. Kabanov and C. Stricker, *The Harrison-Pliska arbitrage pricing theorem under transaction costs*, J. Math. Econom., 35 (2001), pp. 185–196.

[13] W. Schachermayer, *The fundamental theorem of asset pricing under proportional transaction costs in finite discrete time*, Math. Finance, 14 (2004), pp. 19–48.

[14] P. Spoida, *Characterization of market models in the presence of traded vanilla and barrier options*. Preprint, available at http://arxiv.org/abs/1411.4193, 2014.

[15] V. Strassen, *The existence of probability measures with given marginals*, Ann. Math. Statist., 36 (1965), pp. 423–439.

[16] B. Tavin, *Detection of arbitrage in a market with multi-asset derivatives and known risk-neutral marginals*, Journal of Banking & Finance, 53 (2015), pp. 158–178.

[17] A. E. Whalley and P. Wilmott, *An asymptotic analysis of an optimal hedging model for option pricing with transaction costs*, Math. Finance, 7 (1997), pp. 307–324.